REMARKS

An interview was conducted on January 14, 2004 and in view of such interview, a response to the Office Action of October 16, 2003 was filed on January 15, 2004. Meanwhile, the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed January 29, 2004 was received.

In an abundance of caution, Applicants herewith submit a further Supplemental Statement on the Substance of the Interview Summary of January 14, 2004. For the reasons given in the interview conducted on January 14, 2004 and further remarks contained in the response filed January 15, 2004, it is acknowledged that an interview was conducted on January 14, 2004, it was noted that none of the art teaches or suggests a recirculation path for fuel processor gas from a fuel processor outlet to a fuel processor inlet. Further, Van Dine et al. and other art of record do not show a stack by-pass flow path.

It is understood that the features now present in Independent claims 28 and 37 and claims which depend therefrom, render such claims patentable over all of the applied art consistent with the interview and in view of Interview Summary of January 29, 2004 of the Examiner, that certain features as incorporated in the claims, as amended, are not found in the art of record. It is respectfully submitted that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

Serial No. 10/055,101

While Applicants believe that each of the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art, Applicants submit that patentability does not reside solely in the of features identified in the Examiner's Interview Summary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: ___20 Febry 2004___   By: ___[signature]___

                                  Linda M. Deschere
                                  Reg. No.34,811

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

LDES:mnm